

MANIFESTO ISSUED

Senator Tillman Gives Views On Dispensary Question

HE TAKES UP STATE POLITICS

South Carolina Senator Issues an Open Address to the People of His State, in Which He Discusses the Dispensary System and the Status of the Democratic Party—Points Out the Fallacy of Prohibition Which Does Not Prohibit, and Sounds a Warning Against Another State Political Ring.

Columbia, Special.—The long-promised manifesto of Senator Tillman on the dispensary was made public here Saturday afternoon. It is the first broadside of the State campaign now about to open and will be read with great interest throughout the State. The letter was likely scheduled to come out first ahead of the State Democratic convention.

The letter follows:
Fellow Citizens: It is only from a sense of the highest public duty that I feel called upon to address you at this time. Burdened as I am with national concerns, nothing but obligations to the people induce me to take upon my shoulders the additional work of directing your attention to matters affecting the State alone. But I have never felt or believed it to be the wish and intention of the people of South Carolina that my election to the Senate should cause me to lose all interest and concern about home affairs. I was a citizen and taxpayer before I ever held any office at all, and I will be a citizen and taxpayer after I shall cease to hold office. Therefore, it is unnatural and improper from my point of view for me to take no interest and have no thoughts about what is going on in South Carolina.

I have received a great deal of advice recently from the newspapers of our State to the effect that I should attend to my duties in Washington and leave others to discuss and direct affairs at home. The common trend of all of this advice is that I should discuss national questions in the coming State campaign, be re-elected to the Senate, with or without opposition, and not stir up strife. I am warned and threatened should I not heed this counsel, but in spite of it all I feel compelled to speak to the people with my usual frankness and bluntness and let them determine the whole question. I have never sought to dictate to the people. I have only told them the truth as I see it, given my opinions for what they were worth, and I am always willing to abide by their action whatever that may be. It is so in this instance. It gives me no concern that my return to Senate may be jeopardized. There are things more to be dreaded than the loss of a seat in the Senate, and is the loss of my own self-respect. I have been trusted by the people of South Carolina far beyond my deserts, have been chosen as their leader and been followed loyally. Now if after sixteen years I should from selfish motives betray their confidence and allow ambition to draw me aside from the path of duty, I would deserve and expect to receive their contempt and punishment at the polls. I, therefore, scorn all suggestions of cowardly non-interference in State affairs. The people know me too well to be fooled by the assertion that it is my desire to boss or dictate for my sole purpose is to give them the benefit of my experience and knowledge and offer such advice as in my judgment will be conducive to the public welfare. Then I will abide cheerfully by whatever conclusion they may reach. "Teach the people and trust the people" was Jefferson's motto; teach the people and trust the people is equally my motto and that is all I shall attempt to do at this time.

Sixteen years ago there was a revolution in South Carolina which gave the common people of the State for the first time in its history that recognition which was their due and made them in reality the masters of our public affairs. The old ring was overthrown; the primary system which gave every man, however poor and humble, an equal vote with every other man, however rich and high; followed; the new State constitution gave us temporary immunity from negro domination; the utmost freedom of discussion in all political activities was assured; and under these new impulses the State has bounded forward like a race horse along all progressive lines. There are not wanting, however, indications that sinister influences are at work and that a few men are seeking to obtain practical control of the State government and to dominate in our affairs. The corporations have not regained the sway which they once held, but are gradually getting more and more influence and direction in our politics. There are evidences of more than "incipient rottenness" in the State and if the schemes of certain men are not thwarted in the coming primary election, it will be only a short time before another "State ring" will have full sway in our affairs with its headquarters in The State newspaper.

free at Columbia.

There are several things in connection with our State government that I will discuss in the coming campaign, but in this address I shall treat of only two of the things the people of the State should earnestly consider now and take immediate action about. One is the settlement of the whiskey question and the other is the control of the Democratic party of the State by a majority of all of the Democrats rather than by a small fraction of the voters. The two ideas are interlocked and cannot be separated and, therefore, I shall treat them together.

At this time by elections held under the Brier act fifteen counties in the State are enjoying the blessings of prohibition. (Two have always been dry.) No whiskey can be lawfully sold within their borders. But any citizen living in those counties has only to keep his eyes open and look around him to see what the results have been. First let every man who reads a newspaper printed in those counties search its columns and see advertisements of whiskey houses outside of the State; then let him go to the express offices along the lines of the railroads and see how much liquor is being daily brought into those 17 counties. Then let this citizen follow up this liquor and find out who drinks it, but before doing that turn to the editorial pages of these newspapers and see the constant allusions to the "blessings of prohibition," "quietude," "freedom from drunkenness," "peace and good order" that are proclaimed. Of course there are exceptions to this bright and beautiful picture as shown in the news items about the recent murder in Greenville followed by a similar occurrence in Columbia, but upon the whole a man would be very much edified to know how much money flows into the coffers of these journals from whiskey advertisements, while the same papers are exploiting prohibition and sobriety.

A little calm consideration without bias or prejudice will soon convince a man of ordinary sense that the whiskey traffic now as compared with the whiskey traffic under the dispensary is something like this: liquor used to be sold by the pint and quart mainly through the dispensaries; it is now sold through the express offices by the gallon and keg, while the retailing is done by the drink almost everywhere as in the good old barroom days. The moonshiners are of course getting in their work unmolested. There may be less drunkenness, though I doubt it, under the present regime than there was under the dispensary, but what is the actual condition? The poor man cannot get his liquor from Georgia or North Carolina, but must buy from the fellow who brings it in by express or from the moonshiner who peddles it about the country. The rich man has no such trouble and it makes little difference to him whether the supply comes from the dispensary or express office. How was this situation brought about? Is it by the whole Democratic party? Oh, no. Did it come to pass by the votes of the prohibitionists? No. How then? The three elements opposing the dispensary, prohibitionists, high license men and moonshiners or blind tigers, all combined to vote the dispensary out. To make this the more clear I have prepared a table which will be understood at a glance by any man who reads it and which will show conclusively this fact: that a majority of the Democratic voters in no one county declared against the dispensary system and that this prohibition which we now have in these fifteen counties is in no sense the will of the Democracy. Why didn't the people vote at these elections under the Brier Law? The answer is easy. Many of them could not because they were not qualified electors and more of them would not because they were disgusted by the mismanagement and corruption which have been shown to exist in the State dispensary and in some of the county dispensaries.

(Here follows a table giving the vote in the special dispensary elections under the Brier bill, showing that less than one-half of the people voted, while only one-fourth of them were in favor of no dispensary. A second table gives the dispensaries for the fiscal year ending November 30, 1905.)

This sum represents profits alone. A great deal more than this is being sent out of the State to pay for liquor now coming in by express. We have all of the evils of liquor drinking and none of the benefits, but if the people are satisfied, that is their business. Having studied these two tables, I desire to direct attention to these points: the elections under the Brier act and under which the people are now living have in no sense settled the question in those counties. Unless our people have lost all capacity for self-government and are no longer able to think and act for themselves, they will see to it that strong, honest, reliable men are nominated in each county for the Legislature and that each candidate that does not pledge himself to carry out the will of the majority of the people in regard to whiskey shall be defeated. The blind tigers, the barroom element and prohibitionists will doubtless all combine and support anti-dispensary candidates as they have hitherto done, for they will hardly put an candidate pledged to their several policies. It is therefore the dispensary against

the field and the only complication likely to cause trouble is the division among the dispensary advocates of those who want each county to buy liquor for itself and those who think it can be more cheaply and honestly done through the State dispensary. There is therefore danger of the dispensary forces being divided into two factions and of the advocates of the county dispensary system aligning themselves with the other three elements.

Let us consider for a moment the relative advantages and disadvantages of county dispensaries and State dispensary. I declare most emphatically my belief that by proper changes in the law along the lines suggested in the Rayson-Manning bill that all possibility of stealing and bribery in the purchase of whiskey for the State can be prevented and it stands to reason that if the liquor is purchased at wholesale by one board, shipped by the car load, and bottled at one establishment that there will be a great saving in the expense. The county dispensaries would have no facilities for handling the whiskey but leaving all of this out of consideration, the one crucial test of the relative merits of the two systems, State dispensary or county dispensaries, is simply this: if we cannot by law so hedge about and control one State board as to prevent stealing, how in the name of common sense will we be able to watch and prevent thirty or forty boards from doing it? Because the retiring State board and its predecessors has engaged in questionable practices and was guilty of such gross mismanagement and malfeasance in office is no argument to show that the law cannot be changed so as to destroy all opportunity for such practices. No law will execute itself and when those charged with the execution of the law fail utterly and there is neglect from the highest to the lowest, it follows as a matter of course, that it is the duty of the people to elect men who will not flinch or neglect their sworn duties.

It is therefore obvious that the people must look more to the integrity, honesty, truthfulness of the candidates who ask for their votes than to the mere capacity to speak glibly, and the plausible address of the oily politician. The people should bid fence straddlers to get to the rear; they should demand outspoken declarations of policy and no man who failed of his duty in the past should be again entrusted with office. Look at the present disgraceful and outrageous condition in Columbia. The old board of directors of the State dispensary has loaded down the State with about \$700,000 worth of liquor bought on credit in open and direct violation of the law. Why are not these men arrested for malfeasance in office? Why were they not removed last summer when the evidences of gross incompetency any mismanagement were first made public? Why did the Legislature ever elect such men? Why in the face of absolute proof in the letting of glass contracts and in the purchase of labels, to say nothing of the purchase of whiskey that they were guilty of gross misconduct, why I say did the Legislature refuse to change the law when the House found that the Senate would not consent to the abolition of the State dispensary? It was because of the influence of The State newspaper.

There is every reason to believe the House stood out to the last and refused absolutely to amend or alter the law in any particular in the hope and intention to have the State dispensary so far disgraced before the people that in the coming election it would be destroyed. Did these legislators discuss the question of abolishing the State dispensary when they were running for office in 1904? Did they have any authority from the people to abolish the State dispensary because of the mismanagement of the men the Legislature itself had elected? Was not the failure of the House to accept any measure of reform in order to prevent fraud and speculation in the future due entirely to the influences of the new Columbia ring? Was it not clearly shown that the primary object was to destroy the State dispensary and thus pave the way for licensing the sale of liquor in those counties which wanted it, even providing for the wholesale license in Charleston with the purpose of having Charleston sell to the county dispensaries instead of having the State dispensary supply the necessary stock? Was there not a bargain between the prohibitionists and the old barroom or high license element, and is there any man in the State so brazen as to stand up and call this honest politics? Can the men who, with their eyes opened to corruption, refused point blank to reform the State dispensary, have the impudence to ask the people to trust them again?

Fellow citizens, we need some honest politics in South Carolina; we need some straight-forward plain speaking; we need aggressive and honest action by the masses to protect themselves. The people have been asleep. They have been lulled into inaction by the honeyed words of adroit politicians and it is time for them to awake. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Look at the present situation also. A new board is elected to manage the State dispensary under the old law. That old law was fatally defective in some particulars, but it has not been changed in the last two years at least

with regard to competition in bidding for the right to supply the State dispensary with whiskey and in other important particulars. The new board comes into office finding an immense stock of liquor bought on credit and practically all of it bought contrary to law. The Legislature gave to the investigation committee full control and authority in regard to auditing upon these accounts. The new board then is subject to the investigating committee and the situation seems to be this: The authority of managing and directing the affairs of the dispensary is now divided, the new board of directors having some of it and the investigating committee the balance. There is something like \$600,000 worth of debts hanging over the State dispensary. Unless this liquor bought on credit was bought according to law is there any obligations anywhere to keep it and pay for it? Is there not plenty of opportunity for more graft and secret transactions in regard to the settlement of these accounts? Will not the legislative committee be suspected of corruption if it does not get in the middle of the road and stay there; that is stand by the law, obey it itself and require all others to do so? Why so much delay?

I mention this thus early in order to direct the attention of those most interested to this condition in the hope that the State's rights and interests may be protected by all those now in charge, and to serve notice that so far as I am concerned I expect to spare no man in criticism whose actions in this crisis shall not bear the closest scrutiny, and if there is continued negligence and no attempt to punish those responsible for this anomalous and extraordinary state of affairs, it will certainly show that the people need to be aroused and another revolution is in order. I cannot lead it as a candidate for a State office, because it is not inmodest in me to say that I believe I can be of greater use to the people of the State in the Senate, but if I misunderstand the temper of the people and they shall resent my efforts to open their eyes and point out these glaring evils; I am perfectly willing to abide their wishes and will gladly retire to private life rather than to remain silent against the promptings of my sense of duty.

There is one other matter upon which I beg to warn the people. There are evidences in plenty to show that the same clique or ring which is fighting the dispensary and which has always fought me intends or hopes to bring about a change in our primary regulations so as to prevent any Democrat from voting in the primaries who is not at the same time a qualified voter. They hope to use the club which has proved to effective in the Brier Law, that of confining the election to qualified electors to obtain control of the Democratic party to resume their sway, undisputed until 1890. I warn the farmers and all other Democrats, especially operatives who are busily engaged and have little time to devote to politics to attend the next meeting of the Democratic Clubs the fourth Saturday in April (28th) and get their names on the rolls and send delegates to the next county conventions who will represent them. The allies and directors of the new Columbia ring will be on the alert and carry all and, unless the people take more interest than they did in the Brier law elections, the next State convention will be controlled by this element and the possibilities are that the regulations of the Democratic primary will be changed to suit their purposes. The Alliance men of 1890 need not be reminded of the old anecdote of the politician who told the farmers to "plow on," he would attend to their public affairs. Let all of the people take an interest in politics this year which is their duty in order to protect themselves against the schemes of these tricksters and all will be well.

I have felt it my duty to give this warning and whatever the result I will bow to popular will without murmur. If the people want prohibition either the actual article or the humbug which we now have, I do not object; if they want county dispensaries instead of State dispensary, I do not object; what I do object to is that they shall neglect to inform themselves and be led by the nose by designing men. When the Democratic party has spoken authoritatively, I will bow to the will of the majority, but let it be all of the Democratic party and not a small faction which claims to represent our best people.

B. R. TILLMAN.

Greenwood Farmers Won't Increase Acreage.

Greenwood, Special.—President W. J. Moore of the Greenwood County Cotton Association, who has been conducting an anti-increase in cotton acreage campaign in this county, announces positively that there will be no increase in cotton acreage this year so far as Greenwood county is concerned. A vigorous campaign has been conducted for some weeks and interest in the association work has been aroused.

The Pennsylvania Railroad's report shows that its net income last year was \$38,000,000. It is going to be difficult for politicians to understand why a road so prosperous will not invite friends to an occasional free ride, comments the Washington Post.

WILL BE GREAT MEETING

GUBERNATORIAL RACE

Programme of the Twenty-Ninth Annual State Sunday School Convention to be Held April 10-12, 1906, in the Presbyterian Church at Pelzer, South Carolina.

FIRST SESSION.

Tuesday Evening, April 10, 1906.
7.45 P. M. Song Service.
8.00 P. M. Address. President, Rev. W. B. Oliver, Florence, S. C.
8.30 P. M. "The Department of Teacher Training." W. C. Pearce, Chicago, Ill., International Teacher Training Secretary.
9.30 P. M. Enrollment of Delegates. Announcement of Committees and Business. Adjournment.

SECOND SESSION.

Wednesday Morning, April 11, 1906.
9.00 A. M. Quiet Half Hour. Conducted by Rev. F. W. Gregg, Pelzer, S. C.
9.30 A. M. Report of Nominating Committee and Election of Officers.
10.00 A. M. Reports of Officers.
1. The Statistical Secretary, J. Adger Smythe, Jr., Pelzer, S. C.
2. The Treasurer, Rev. W. I. Herbert, Columbia, S. C.
3. Superintendent of Primary Department, Mrs. M. A. Carlisle, Newberry, S. C.
4. Teacher Training Secretary, E. L. Hughes, Greenville, S. C.
5. Home Department Secretary.
6. The Executive Committee. William E. Pelham, Chairman.
11.00 A. M. Address by W. C. Pearce, Chicago, Ill. Subject, "Approved Workmen: How Secured."
12.00 P. M. Round Table. Modern Sunday School Methods.
12.30 P. M. Adjournment.

THIRD SESSION.

Wednesday Afternoon, April 11, 1906.
2.30-2.45 P. M. Song Service.
2.45-3.45 P. M. Superintendents' Conference. Leader, W. C. Pearce, Chicago, Ill.
3.45-4.30 P. M. "Temperance Work in the Twentieth Century Sunday School." C. C. Featherstone, Laurens, S. C.
4.30-5.00 P. M. Round Table Talks.
5.00 P. M. Reception to the Delegates by the Brotherhood of Andrew and Philip, Pelzer Presbyterian Chapter, No. 280.

FOURTH SESSION.

Wednesday Evening, April 11, 1906.
7.45 P. M. Song Service.
8.00 P. M. Address, "The New Day Dawning for Our Bible Schools; A Report of the Toronto Convention." Rev. W. E. Wilkins, Columbia, S. C.
9.00 P. M. "My Impressions of the Toronto Convention." Rev. James H. Thornwell, D. D., Fort Mill, S. C.

FIFTH SESSION.

Thursday, April 12, 1906.
9.00-9.30 A. M. Quiet Half Hour.
Rev. G. T. Edwards, Pelzer, S. C.
9.30-10.30 A. M. Primary Methods.
1. Cradle Roll. Miss Grace W. Vandiver, Spartanburg, S. C.
2. The Beginners, or "Kindergarten Methods in Sunday School Work." Miss Kitty T. Perrin, Greenville, S. C.
3. Primary Department Work. Mrs. M. A. Carlisle, Newberry, S. C.
10.30-11.00 A. M. Discussion.
11.00 A. M. 12 M. Reverence in the Sunday School. W. C. Pearce, Chicago, Ill.
12 M. 12.30 P. M. Round Table.
12.30 P. M. Adjournment.

SIXTH SESSION.

Thursday, April 12, 1906.
2.00 P. M. Conference on Home Department Work.
3.00-4.00 P. M. The Relation of the Sunday School to the College. J. N. O. Linn, Greenwood, S. C.
Rev. E. M. Potat, D. D., President Furman University, Greenville, S. C.
4.00 P. M. Closing Words. Adjournment.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

William E. Pelham, Chairman, Newberry, S. C.
Rev. T. H. Law, D. D., Spartanburg, S. C.
Dr. E. C. Jones, Newberry, S. C.
Rev. Melton Clark, Florence, S. C.
S. B. Ezell, Spartanburg, S. C.
Rev. W. P. Witsell, Columbia, S. C.
Dr. George B. Crozier, Newberry, S. C.
Rev. J. W. Shell, Spartanburg, S. C.
Hon. J. E. Ellerbe, Sellers, S. C.

OFFICERS.

President—Rev. W. B. Oliver, Florence, S. C.
Vice-President—C. C. Featherstone, Laurens, S. C.
Treasurer—Rev. W. I. Herbert, Columbia, S. C.
Secretary—W. Austin Hudson, Greenville, S. C.
Statistical Secretary—J. Adger Smythe, Jr., Pelzer, S. C.
Teacher Training Secretary—E. L. Hughes, Greenville, S. C.
Primary Superintendent—Mrs. M. A. Carlisle, Newberry, S. C.
Entertainment will be provided for all delegates. Notify Mr. A. M. Lauder, Pelzer, of your coming. Railroad companies have granted special rates for this Convention, on certificate plan. Every Sunday School is entitled to be represented.
Interesting and full exhibits of Sunday School helps—appliances, books, maps, charts, and the like—will be made by several of the leading publishing houses.

State Senator Cole L. Blease States His Position, as a Candidate For Governor, on the Dispensary and Other Matters.

Newberry, Special.—State Senator Cole L. Blease was seen and his attention was called to the reports published in the newspapers throughout the State to the effect that he would be in the next gubernatorial campaign. Mr. Blease was asked to make a definite statement in regard to his candidacy. He was asked the direct question, "Will you be a candidate for Governor this summer?"

"Yes, sir; I am in the race," he said. "I have been for some time and expect to be in until the finish."

"It appears that probably the leading issue in the coming campaign will be the liquor question: what is your position on the dispensary?" was asked Mr. Blease.

"I think it very unfortunate that our people should have reached the point where dealing with the whiskey problem is to be the paramount issue of the State campaign," he replied; "especially at this time when matters commercial and industrial. There are many things which the people should consider in electing their officers besides this one. However, in 1892 I voted for the dispensary and I have been from that time and am now in favor of the dispensary system. That is: I am in favor of the repeal of the Brier law. I am in favor of the dispensary system for the handling of the whiskey question, as I believe it to be the best solution. I think it too large a question to be made a local issue. It is a State issue, and should be decided by the whole people of the State in a primary election. I have always approved submitting it in a general election, because that would allow a class of people to vote who should not be permitted to settle question between the white Democrats."

"Are you in favor of the State dispensary?"

"I am, because I believe it is the best way to manage the business. If, as some charge, it is corrupt, how much more corrupt would there be for corruption if there were 41 purchasing powers instead of one. In other words, I am in favor of the State dispensary management and the repeal of the Brier law."

Mr. Blease was asked what he would do with the counties which have already voted out the dispensary under the Brier law.

"If the people of the State vote in favor of State management and the repeal of the Brier law," was his reply, the General Assembly would then pass such laws as would permit the establishment of dispensaries in all counties where there are none or forbid the establishment of dispensaries in such counties, upon certain conditions, and if those counties which have voted out the dispensary were to comply with these provisions that dispensaries would be re-established therein. In 1902, when I was a candidate for Lieutenant Governor, I told the people all over the State that the whiskey question was not settled, although some candidates proclaimed from the stump in loud tones that it had been settled and that the people were satisfied. I knew then that it was not true and that the campaign then being managed in the form that it was was only to blind the dispensary people. It has come out as I predicted. The fight had then just begun. The dispensary people were sleeping. The combination against it of all its enemies was lying dormant for the purpose of striking it its death blow. Just as I thought the thing has turned out, and there are now people claiming to be for the dispensary who are hoping to get office upon it, and at heart would smash the State out of it if it were in their power."

"Are there any other matters which would like to mention?" was asked Senator Blease.

"Yes, sir," he replied. "I am in favor of biennial sessions of the General Assembly. I am in favor of a law prohibiting children under 12 years of age from working in cotton mills. I am in favor of a law limiting the hours of labor in cotton mills to ten hours per day, and for railroad employes making it not more than fifteen hours per day. I am in favor of liberal appropriation to provide for our Confederate soldiers. I am in favor of liberal, but no extravagant, appropriations for our State institutions of learning, and in favor of building up the free school system so that every white child in this State can be given a common school education in comfortable and convenient school houses. I am in favor of taxes paid by the white people going to and being used only for the education of white children. I am opposed to the extra court system, as it has been practiced within the last couple of years. I am opposed to the extravagant appropriations which in some instances are being made by the General Assembly. There are other matters which I might mention as being opposed to or being in favor of, but when they are presented by the advocates of them on the stump I will then present to the people fully my views upon all questions that may be raised in the campaign, and rest my candidacy upon my record in the State Legislature and the State Senate."